

Liberal Democrats Help Knife Civil Rights Bill

Morse in Move To Deliver Bill To Eastland

By Fred Halstead

JULY 10 — A sell-out on civil rights legislation is proceeding in the United States Senate this week. Two liberal Democrats, Senators Wayne Morse of Oregon and

A Report From The Tuskegee Freedom Front

By Ronald Jones

TUSKEGEE, ALA., July 2—“Don't You Let Nobody Turn You Around,” a soul-stirring, spirited spiritual with a great message and a pulsatingly rhythmic beat emerged spontaneously from the very depths of the inspired and determined gathering of more than 3,500 Tuskegee Negroes and scores of out-of-town visitors tonight at the historic Washington Chapel AME Church. This song accurately reflected the unfolding spirit and mood of the second weekly mass meeting of the Tuskegee Civic Association, which is leading the Negroes in this predominantly Negro area in a Crusade for Citizenship.

The Crusade began firmly last week as a reaction to the unanimous passing in both houses of the Alabama Legislature of State Senator Sam Engelhardt's bill to gerrymander all but 10 voting Negroes out of the city limits of Tuskegee and not a single one of the 600 white voters. [Engelhardt is also secretary of the Alabama Association of (White) Citizens' Councils.] The Crusade has as its immediate aims (1) halting the enactment of the city limits bill, (2) getting a functioning board of registrars which will register all qualified citizens, and (3) stimulating a greater interest among local Negroes in

MORSE ACTION

The liberal Democrat Morse announced his intention today to get the bill referred to the Senate Judiciary committee headed by racist Senator Eastland of Mississippi. This would deal the bill a mortal blow. Morse said he would make his motion when the present debate on whether the bill should be introduced on the Senate floor is concluded, as it is expected

(Continued on page 4)

IN THIS ISSUE

Report on:
Young Socialist League
Convention
(See Page 3.)

Vol. XXI - No. 28



NEW YORK, N. Y., MONDAY, JULY 15, 1957

PRICE 10c

THE MILITANT

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

Kremlin Chiefs Utilize Purge In Bid for Popular Support

This Photograph is Now Out of Date



Three of these eight top Soviet officials have now been kicked out of their high posts and subjected to a “unanimous” campaign of condemnation as an “anti-party” group. In the place of honor in Red Square during a May Day parade, from left to right are: Marshal K. E. Voroshilov, Defense Minister Marshall G. K. Zhukov, Premier Marshall N. A. Bulganin, CPSU head N. S. Khrushchev, Minister of Power Stations G. M. Malenkov (ousted), Building Materials Minister L. M. Kaganovich (ousted), Deputy A. I. Mikoyan and the former Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov (ousted). The three ousted officials have not yet been expelled from the party. But their future does not look bright.

Denounce Ousted Four; Pledge More Butter and Less Terror

By Harry Ring

JULY 10 — The ruling bureaucracy in the Soviet Union, whose vast material privileges bring it into irreconcilable conflict with the growing demand of the Soviet workers for workers' democracy and improved living conditions, is in a state of deepening crisis. It is now feverishly seeking a measure of popular support for its dictatorial regime. The extent of its crisis is reflected in the scope of the attack it launched against the now-deposed members of the ruling clique, Molotov, Malenkov, Kaganovich and Shepilov.

and that Molotov had characterized him as “a Trotskyite and an opportunist.” This report has been given wide circulation in the American press.)

20TH CONGRESS UPHELD

Within the Soviet Union, the most emphasized charge against the four is that of opposing the reforms pledged at the 20th Congress. The rest of the accusations hurled against the four are closely patterned after Khrushchev's indictment of Stalin at the Congress. This is a decisive indication of the factors behind the present purge. For regardless how the charges may fit each of the accused, they represent a reaffirmation by the victorious faction of the line of concessions pledged at the 20th Congress. This means a recognition on the part of Khrushchev and Co. that the concessions cannot be cancelled without risking the outbreak of working class struggle.

Indeed, the winning group could not just stand pat. It had to couple its attack on the deposed four with glowing new promises to the Soviet working people. Khrushchev grandly announced in Leningrad that “We want the Soviet People to have enough meat, butter, milk and fruit, and that our shops be filled with

(Continued on page 2)

Khrushchev and 'Revolutionary Law'

An Editorial

In announcing the purge of Molotov, Malenkov and Kaganovich, the official communiqué of the Soviet Communist Party said that one of the main reasons why they were being ousted was because they were guilty of “stubborn resistance to the measures . . . to eliminate the violations of revolutionary law that had been committed.”

Genuine revolutionary law, which is the law of workers' democracy, surely does not offer less than capitalist law which guarantees the accused the right to be heard and places upon the accusers the responsibility to back up charges with evidence. Workers' democracy is much more. It is the rule of the working people. Where they are denied a voice in the exercise of that law, it ceases to exist.

All of these concepts of working-class legality have been brutally trampled upon by Khrushchev in this purge. Following the original charges against the four, new and graver charges are heaped promiscuously upon them. Following the “unanimous” expulsion vote in the Central Committee comes the announcement of the “unanimous” support to the move by the Soviet people, an announcement issued in virtually the same breath as the news of the ouster itself. The entire bureaucratic procedure is best summed up in Khrushchev's cynical explanation to the Czechs: “We took the black sheep by the tail and threw them out.”

Accusers and Accused Are Guilty

Our own condemnation of this odious business does not spring from any political sympathy for the now fallen bureaucrats. As far back as 1937, the International Commission of Inquiry into the Moscow Trials, headed by the late Professor John Dewey, proved conclusively that all of the associates of Stalin — the present accusers and the present accused alike — were guilty of the destruction of Soviet legality. For this we believe they deserve punishment by a revolutionary court of the Soviet working people.

However, the current moves to make the deposed four the scapegoats for crimes of which the rest of the bureaucracy is equally guilty serves only to preserve the whole frame-up system which Stalin created.

If Malenkov, Molotov, Kaganovich and Shepilov are to be put on trial by their former partners in crime — and despite the present show of “leniency” to Malenkov this remains a distinct possibility — the trial must at least be an open one. The accused must be permitted to select attorneys of their choice. Finally, international representatives of the socialist and labor movements should be permitted to observe the procedure at first hand.

If the four are not to be brought to trial, they should be permitted to present their defense to the Soviet people through newspaper, radio, etc. Let the Soviet people judge for themselves the validity of the present charges.

In urging such a stand, we address ourselves particularly to the membership of the Communist Party and to the editors of the Daily Worker. On July 9, that paper editorially deplored the lack of public discussion prior to the expulsions and declared that “The process of democratization requires such public debate.” The Daily Worker should follow up on this correct statement by demanding an end to the process of guilt by denunciation and the full application of democratic procedures.

The New Factors in the Purge System

By Myra Tanner Weiss

Those who took seriously Khrushchev's promise of “collective leadership” given to the 20th Congress were naturally shocked at the purge of his opponents, the so-called “anti-party” group. But they were reckoning without considering the nature of the bureaucratic caste that rules the Soviet orbit.

The purge of the dead Stalin in February of 1956 was not the result of a democratic re-evaluation of the past history of the Soviet Union. Nor was it an adoption of democratic procedures. The destruction of the Stalin myth grew out of the crisis of the Kremlin bureaucracy — a crisis born in the mounting anger of the working class at the continued repressions and miserable existence to which they were condemned by bureaucratic rule.

The bureaucrats, in a desperate struggle for survival, attempted to pass off all the sins of the past into the corpse of the “infallible leader.” They met the crisis with a scapegoat, conciliation, promises and of course — unanimity. But the crisis was not resolved. Instead it deepened, extended and intensified. And therefore it finds expression in a new internal crisis and new purges.

DISCUSSION A MENACE

The bureaucracy is constitutionally incapable of collective

leadership. The many similarities between the present purge and those of Stalin arise out of the fact that the bureaucracy which Khrushchev now heads is the same social formation that Stalin represented. Collective leadership is impossible without a genuine discussion of programmatic differences at least within the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. But the moment controversy of any kind comes close to the powerful and politically conscious working class, this class seeks to intervene and to win the right of discussing and deciding all questions. The very existence of the bureaucratic caste would then be challenged.

Yet those who think that Khrushchev is stepping into Stalin's shoes and can restore the system of terror that existed before the 20th Congress, do not understand the fundamental difference between two quite opposite epochs in the history of the bureaucratic caste — its rise and its decline.

Stalin came into power with the receding of the revolutionary tide of the working class. Exhausted by years of war for survival in an imperialist encirclement, confronted with the consuming struggle for subsistence in the economic backwardness of the young workers' state, the working class was compelled to retreat from the center of the political life of

the country. The bureaucrats and careerists came to the fore and over a period of many years were able to destroy democratic Soviets and the Communist Party as it existed under Lenin and Trotsky. The party was physically destroyed in the bloody purges of the 1930's. Each defeat of the working class in the capitalist world — and there were many in the pre-World War II years — strengthened the bureaucracy and tightened Stalin's hold on the political life of the country.

RIISING MOVEMENT

Today the working class of the Soviet Union is on the ascendancy. It is preparing to re-enter the political arena where it will pit its socialist

aspirations against the privilege-seeking of the usurping oligarchy. The bureaucratic caste is doomed. It is no longer possible to maintain the working class in subjection through a system of police terror. The working class, 48 million strong, steeped in the revolutionary tradition of its origin, will no longer tolerate the abuses of the past — economic or political.

That is why Khrushchev's purge is only a weak echo of the blood-bath periodically unleashed by Stalin. The problem of the bureaucracy today is to stem the tide, to postpone as long as possible the day of final reckoning.

While neither side in the controversy between the two groups of top Kremlin functionaries can bring their differences to the

Soviet people for a democratic resolution, it is equally clear that the crisis cannot be resolved by resort to the old methods of Stalinist rule. The idea that mass opposition can be crushed in the same way as in the past is as unrealistic as the dream of isolationist Republicans that the United States can return to an economy “free” of state subsidization and international entanglements.

History cannot move backward. The Soviet bureaucracy confronts the preparatory stages of the political revolution. In its struggle for survival, it will oscillate wildly between repression and concession with the latter becoming increasingly necessary as the working class gains in confidence and understanding of its historic task.

Fryer Writes to Aptheker On the Truth About Hungary

Dear Comrade Aptheker,

I have just finished reading your book, *The Truth About Hungary*, on the Hungarian revolution. It seems to me that the best sentence in it appears on page 153, where you write:

“The whole content of Marxism-Leninism is so revolutionary, its whole outlook and spirit and essence are so contrary to dogmatism and elitism that adherence to it in however limited and partial and distorted a form brings protest against injustice and tyranny.”

If this were the spirit that informed your book; if this were the epitaph you had written on the victims of Russian intervention last October and of Kadar's repression since then; if this were your summary of the roots and driving forces of Hungary's revolt; how wise and how splendid your book would be.

A HASH

But you have chosen to take one aspect of the “truth about Hungary” and inflate it to monstrous proportions by stuffing your pages to satiety with a hash of press clippings, tag-ends of quotations, scraps of documents,

The author of this open letter to Herbert Aptheker is Peter Fryer, former special correspondent for the London Daily Worker in Budapest, Hungary and author of “Hungarian Tragedy,” an eye-witness account of the Hungarian revolution. Peter Fryer is now the Militant's London Special Correspondent.

lumps of speeches, odds and ends of statistics—an undigested, indigestible ragbag parading as historical scholarship.

Your name is respected on this side of the Atlantic, Comrade Aptheker, among those who know and admire the brave resistance that American Marxist intellectuals have put up to the witch hunt.

You are known as a scholar and a fighter for truth and liberty. I am bound to tell you that your book will do nothing to enhance your reputation. I venture to predict that within less than a decade you yourself will bitterly repent of it.

For you have chosen to produce an apology for the crushing of a revolution. With flailing scissors and a bucket of paste you have slapped together every gleeful, gloating word you

could find, from every conceivable reactionary source, hailing the Hungarian events as the fulfillment of imperialist dreams.

Was it hard to find such comment? Not in the least. “Extremes meet,” in politics as elsewhere, and the reactionaries of the Right and “Left” find common ground in characterizing the Hungarian events as counter-revolution.

Their common interest was to magnify to the utmost every negative and disagreeable strand in the pattern.

Anti-Semitism: of course it existed, but on so small a scale (remarkably small, considering Hungary's years under Horthy) that the Budapest Board of Rabbis could broadcast on November 2:

“Hungarian Jewry enthusiastically salutes the achievements of the revolution, pays reverent homage to the heroes, and identifies itself with the free and independent homeland.”

On so small a scale that the newspaper *Igazsag* could report on October 30: “Meeting an AVO officer, a raging crowd was about to strike him, but realizing that he was a Jew, several of the armed demonstrators took his defense. Those ‘fascists’ rose in defense of an officer so that

(Continued on page 2)

New York

Militant Labor Forum

“The Kremlin Purge — Its Real Significance”

Wednesday, July 17, 8 P.M.

Adelphi Hall

71 Fifth Avenue

(Near 14th Street)

Contribution 50 cents

What Next For Eastern Europe?

By C. R. Hubbard

JULY 9—The crisis in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had its counterpart in the East European countries. And as the crisis in the Kremlin led to a purge of top officials, it is likely that the struggle in East Europe will also see a consolidation of Khrushchev's forces by means of the purge.

On June 26 a stormy debate took place in Warsaw between Gomulka and his old-line Stalinist opponents, a further development of the fight that occurred last May. The conflict had grown much sharper. Gomulka's opponents felt strong enough to move organizationally against him. The old-line Stalinists attempted to place their own leaders on the committee that would control nomination to the party's Warsaw officers. Gomulka reportedly defeated this move by a majority of only nine out of 400 votes.

POT AND KETTLE

Gomulka's hand was strengthened in May through the Central Committee's expulsion of M. Radkiewicz and Jakob Berzman from the party on the charge of responsibility for police terror in Poland from 1949 to 1954. The old-line Stalinists charged that these two men were victimized as "scapegoats" for other party leaders. They accused three top supporters of Gomulka for responsibility for past "errors." On this question, of course, both sides are right.

Hungarian Premier Janos Kadar met the same kind of opposition that Gomulka encountered. Chief spokesman for the old-guard Stalinists at the Hungarian conference of Communists held in June was Jozsef Revai, Minister of Culture under the tyrannical reign of Rakosi. Kadar won this "violent debate" and warned that "a great threat would menace the future work of the party" if the "faults of the old leadership" were forgotten.

ISSUES AT STAKE

What issues are at stake in these internal struggles of the Communist Parties of East Europe? Basically the bureaucratic caste throughout the Soviet orbit is in a life and death struggle for survival. The working class has begun to enter into the arena of political life. And it has entered with greatest force in the countries of East Europe where it was denied any role whatsoever in the social transformations which were effected by bureaucratic and military means.

The victory of the so-called "revisionists" was predicated on the fact that the old Stalinist methods of police dictatorship which developed in the ebb of revolutionary tide today encounter a resurgent working class. Khrushchev and company understand this and seek to counterbalance the growing power of the working class through conciliation to capitalist elements in the Eastern European countries. The die-hard Stalinists see the danger in this conciliation. Yet

their course holds even greater dangers for the future of the Soviet orbit, for their repression only permit the contradictions to accumulate, sharpen and head for explosion all over again. As bureaucrats, neither wing will allow, let alone lead the working class to power. Yet only along this road can the planned economy be safeguarded.

CAPITALIST REVIVAL

Gomulka was accused of conciliation to capitalist tendencies—and with good reason. The struggle for collectivized land has stopped in Poland. The government now permits the purchase and sale of land. The "free" sale of crops has been permitted and is likely to be put into effect. As Ann Su Cardwell of the Christian Science Monitor reported last April, "Private industry, formerly slated to disappear, is encouraged now, and little shops of various kinds are appearing throughout the country. . . . Once started they may be doubly hard to eliminate again."

Capitalist hopes also got a new lift with the growing strength of the Catholics in Poland. On June 28 in Poznan it is reported that 200,000 marched through the city to cap the week-long Corpus Christi celebrations. (This coincided with the anniversary of 1st year's Poznan rising.) "Hundreds of girls in the white First Communion dresses strewed flower petals in the streets before priests garbed in splendid vestments." On June 20 a procession of 300,000 welcomed Cardinal Wyszyński back from his visit with the Pope in Rome.

In Hungary, too, where the workers are brutally repressed, concessions are made to capitalist tendencies on the land. As Elie Abel reported in the N. Y. Times July 7, "The peasantry has less cause for complaints than at any time since World War II. It alone has been allowed to hold the gains of the revolution—higher farm prices, no great pressure for collectivization and an end of forced deliveries."

WARNING TO WORKERS

The report of the May conference of the Polish Communist Party by Francois Fejto in France Observer, May 28, clearly revealed the issues in the internal party crisis. On the existence of workers' councils in the factories of Poland, Gomulka warned that they must not dream of becoming "organs of political power of the working class" on the model of the Soviets of workers, deputies of the past. And they must not pretend to constitute "administrative units of popular power." They must not substitute themselves for the unions. They must not consider themselves the owners of the factories nor try to go beyond the bounds of the factory. Finally Gomulka made it clear that the party organization must remain the directing political force in each factory.

Gomulka answered the charge of conciliation of pro-capitalist forces by saying, "You criticize my agrarian policy. You pretend that it is a bad one and that it will lead to capitalism. Very well then, propose another, a better policy. I'm all ready to adopt it. Only you don't have another policy. Your criticism is dogmatic and empty."

Neither wing in the Communist Parties has or will put forth a revolutionary policy which alone can resolve the crisis in the Soviet orbit. A new revolutionary party must be forged among the factory workers with the fundamental Leninist aim of "full power to the workers' councils" and an end to all repression and bureaucratic power and privilege.

The Underlying Force in the Crisis



... Kremlin Bids for Support

(Continued from page 1)

many inexpensive and pretty fabrics and clothes—everything that makes man's life more beautiful."

This theme was echoed by Shvernik, who demagogically asserted that "the Party and the Government display a constant concern with the welfare of the people." As an example of this "concern" he cited the recent decision abolishing obligatory deliveries of agricultural products to the state from the small, personally owned garden plots of members of the farm collectives.

THEY WANT MORE

As far as the workers are concerned, every concession they wrest from the ruling bureaucracy sharpens their appetite for more. Every new promise they receive rivets their attention on the performance of the Kremlin oligarchs. Actual concessions and the promise of more to come strengthens the self-confidence of the working class as it realizes that the bureaucratic tops are acting out of a sense of danger to their dictatorial rule. "It has happened more than once," wrote Leon Trotsky in 1937 (The Revolution Betrayed), "that a bureaucratic dictatorship, seeking salvation in liberal reforms, has only weakened itself."

In Hungary and Poland, the promises and concessions undermined the stability of the Stalinist regimes to such an extent that they formed the prelude to the workers' uprisings last fall. The same dynamics are at work in the USSR itself.

To prevent the Soviet masses from taking immediate advantage of the cleavage in the bureaucracy, the faction headed by Khrushchev resorted to totalitarian purge methods against its opponents. Under a regime of workers' democracy, basic differences in the leading body of the party on national and international issues would be brought to the party ranks for a thoroughgoing, democratic discussion. The people themselves would have been participants in the resolution of differences.

Instead, we witness again the bureaucratic methods established by Stalin. First comes a surprise denunciation and ouster of the accused who are not even permitted to be heard. No record of the discussion or differences are produced. Once more the Soviet people are told to take the word of one gang of bureaucrats that a rival gang has been responsible for all their ills.

In one breath the Khrushchev gang denounces the hateful methods of the 1930's. In the next, they borrow freely from its method of "political discussion." Thus the government paper, Izvestia, suddenly discovers that "in the past, the role of Kaganovich in the development of railroad transport has been greatly exaggerated. . . . He is to blame for the fact that for many years we have been delayed in the electrification of railroads, that we are lagging behind in implementing the use of the advanced electric and diesel transportation." A local bureaucrat quickly chimes in that Kaganovich was directly responsible for the shortage of building materials in his region.

The Kremlin cannot erase their ingrained police mentality. Their problem now is that they can no longer assure their rule and privileges by the old methods of police terror. In addition to the concessions and the promises, this is signified by elevation for the first time of a powerful army figure, Zhukov, to the Presidium. Evidently no longer able to rely on the dread GPU to prop it up, the bureaucracy must now turn more and more to the army as its last base of armed support.

But history, including the very recent history of Eastern Europe, proves that this last resort of tyrants is the least trustworthy of all. A secret police organization like the GPU can recruit the scum of society capable of any necessary terror against the people. But an army must recruit from the people itself and cannot be counted on in a showdown to stand fast with the oppressors against the oppressed.

At the very outset of the Polish and Hungarian revolts the ranks of the armies of those countries quickly demonstrated they stood with the people against the bureaucrats. Even with the Soviet army that invaded Hungary, there were numerous reports of acts of solidarity and fraternization with the Hungarian people.

In Leningrad, Shvernik castigated the deposed bureaucrats for "having lost all touch with the masses and with the life of the people." These, at least, are true words. They apply equally to the entire bureaucracy. It is precisely why it now moves to placate the masses in the hope of forestalling the inevitable day when the now giant Soviet working class moves to restore its long-throttled democratic rule.

How Communist Parties Reacted To Purge News

The "independent thinking" pledged by the various Communist parties after the 20th Congress was not evident in the official reactions of these parties to the present Kremlin purge.

The East German Communist Party July 4 hailed the ouster of "the hostile group of Malenkov, Kaganovich and Molotov." On the same day the Hungarian party dutifully "welcomed" the purge but also warned "revisionist-minded persons" in Hungary not to try to take advantage of it. The French party also declared, July 4, its "full solidarity" with the Kremlin's "example of firmness."

The news was also promptly hailed in Italy by CP leader Togliatti as a move toward peace. And the London Daily Worker said that in executing the purge, "the principles of inner-party democracy" had been "meticulously observed."

...Aptheker Book

(Continued from page 1)

their revolution would not be branded as an 'anti-Semitic and fascist' demonstration."

On so small a scale that young communists in Budapest told the correspondent of the London Observer: "You will find thousands of Jewish boys and girls among the Freedom Fighters, especially in Budapest. Hundreds have died fighting."

MINDSZENTY

Certainly Cardinal Mindszenty made a broadcast. But the overall effect of his speech was to reinforce the authority of the Nagy Government. In no way can his broadcast be construed as a call for the restoration of capitalist property relations. That very morning the Catholic newspaper Sziv had written: "We renounce the nationalized estates of the Church."

Certainly there was hooliganism. But it was dealt with—and dealt with highly effectively—by the workers' councils. At Győr the armed people stopped a fascist poet, Gyula Somogyváry, from broadcasting his poems when he arrived at the radio station with a band of armed men. In Budapest the adventurer Jozsef Dudas was arrested by order of General Pal Maleter when he tried to occupy the Foreign Office.

Where is the revolution in the whole history of mankind that has not been sullied with such incidents, as it suddenly swept up the most backward elements of the population into the maelstrom, as it hurled them down the avalanche of history?

Did not Lenin, insisting that there could never be a "pure" social revolution, describe the Russian Revolution of 1905 as "a series of battles in which all the discontented classes, groups and elements of the population participated," among them "masses imbued with the crudest prejudices, with the vaguest and most fantastic aims of struggle," "small groups which accepted Japanese money," "speculators and adventurers, etc.," who brought into the movement "their prejudices, their reactionary fantasies, their weaknesses and errors," but without whose participation "no revolution is possible?" (Collected Works, Vol. XIX, p. 302)

VENGEANCE ON AVH

Need we be surprised if in the midst of just such a "heterogeneous and discordant, motley and outwardly incohesive mass struggle," as Lenin called it, a section of the Budapest population took a terrible vengeance on the AVH men who had repressed them, who had tortured fellow Hungarians, who had ruled Hungary for Rakosi and his Russian masters in a way that you yourself describe as "painful"?

Let the Polish communist journalist Wiktor Worosylski say whether this amounted to "White Terror." His diary for Nov. 3 recorded: "Budapest was quiet today. As on Friday, there were no cases of summary execution. . . . We tried to estimate the number of lynching victims in the city from Tuesday to Thursday morning. The most likely figure ranges from 70 to 80 persons. There is every indication, in the present situation, that there is no risk of the number increasing." (Dec. 9 'Nowa Kultura'.)

Let the Swiss journalist Peter Schmid describe the confidential personal dossier system which more than anything else aroused the fury of the Budapest crowds: "The files [at the Csepe iron and steel works] lay scattered

THE TRUTH ABOUT HUNGARY. By Herbert Aptheker. 256 pages. New York: Mainstream Publishers. 1957. Paper \$2.00 — Cloth \$3.00.

and torn on the floor. A couple of workers had found their own files in the rubbish, and as they studied the ideological fairy tales that the deposed communist bosses had woven around them, their faces took on a queer look that was partly made up of the fear they had once felt and partly of a kind of boyish amusement." (January issue of Commentary.)

But it is too easy to pit quotation against quotation, Comrade Aptheker. You quote from many capitalist journalists; for each of your quotations I could find another, often from the identical source, putting in its true perspective the picture you paint of "White Terror" and "pogroms" and the "moving to the Right" of the Nagy Government.

COMMUNIST OBSERVERS

However I do not base my case on what bourgeois journalists wrote, but on the testimony which you in your . . . scholarly fashion ignore, that of socialist and communist observers—Worosylski; his colleague Marjan

Rundschau for ten years, and representative in Budapest of ADN, the East German news agency.

AN OUTRAGE

"The chief reason for my break," he said, "is that I wrote about the Hungarian tragedy in the only way any decent human being can write of it. I told my friends that the Soviet intervention was a stinking outrage [Schweinerei] that had nothing whatsoever to do with socialism." (Dec. 3 Die Welt, Hamburg.)

Have you written about Hungary as a "decent person," Comrade Aptheker? Your book shows Hungary's pre-October suffering and the glory and heroism and striving and hope of the October days in a distorting mirror.

Worst of all, it is silent on the ceaseless terror that has been waged against the Hungarian people since last Nov. 4. Your statement that "Repression . . . appears to be characterized by marked moderation" is on a par with Khrushchev's recent echo of an earlier tyrant's boast: "Complete calm now reigns in Hungary." (June 30 Pravda.)

The task of the Marxist historian is surely to penetrate to the essence of the events he is describing and analyzing. It is neither Marxism nor scholarship to assert of the Hungarian revolution that "the majority of the working class did not participate in the fighting."

KADAR ON THE STAND

Let me call only one witness to scotch this lie, Comrade Aptheker. A man who said of "our revolution" that in it "numerous communists fought at the side of students, workers and the people."

And who said this? None other than Janos Kadar, in an interview published in Il Giornale d'Italia on Nov. 2. The same Janos Kadar who said in a broadcast the previous day: "In their glorious uprising our people have shaken off the Rakosi regime. . . . Thousands and thousands of workers and peasants . . . fought in the front line."

Kadar chose to forget these words and to become a puppet of the Soviet bureaucracy. You have chosen to produce a book that tells—yes, SOME of the truth about Hungary, but so selected and presented and intermingled with lies and slanders against the Hungarian people that it will survive, if at all, only as a literary curiosity, a monument to the misplaced zeal of last-ditch Stalinist apologists.

Many years ago Marx referred to the bourgeois economists as "hired prize-fighters" who substituted for genuine scientific research "the bad conscience and the evil intent of apologetic."

Hungary's finest communists (or, rather, those who have not been murdered) are still in Kadar's jails, because they remain unrepentant opponents of Stalinism and its crimes. Their bodies may have been broken, but they have kept their integrity and their consciences are clear.

Is your conscience clear, Comrade Aptheker?

Peter Fryer

America's Road to Socialism

by

JAMES P. CANNON

80 pages

35 cents

Order from
Pioneer Publishers

116 University Place
New York 3, N. Y.

Introductory Offer!

A Six-Month Subscription
To The Militant Only \$1

The Militant
116 University Place
New York 3, N. Y.

Name
Street Zone
State

Khrushchev Industry Plan an Issue in Purge

By George Lavan

Khrushchev's destruction of that wing of the Kremlin oligarchy headed by Malenkov, Molotov and Kaganovich reveals the tremendous importance of the recent decentralization of Soviet industry. This was apparently made a show-down issue between the rival wings of the top bureaucracy, and Khrushchev's triumph on this issue two months ago foreshadowed the definitive defeat of his opponents.

The constant factor in the picture was the unpostponable necessity of reorganizing Soviet industry which, thanks to the inherent merits of planned economy, had outgrown in size and complexity the dictatorial, bureaucratic straitjacket in which Stalin had kept it. The overhead cost in waste, duplication, bungling, predominance of narrow departmental interests over the general interest, had become so great that it threatened the further development of the economy. Furthermore it was discrediting in the eyes of the entire Soviet people the whole bureaucratic ruling caste which attempts to justify its highly privileged economic and social position in Soviet Society by claims

that its administrative and technical know-how makes it indispensable.

All sections of the Kremlin oligarchy recognized that the management of Soviet industry could not continue as it was. It had to be reorganized. But the key question for Stalin's heirs was: Who should reorganize it? A reorganization of industry and consequently of the bureaucracy could cut the very ground from one or more sections of the Kremlin oligarchy. For these oligarchs, ever since Stalin's destruction of the workers' democracy established by Lenin and Trotsky, are neither elected by nor represent the Soviet workers but represent various sections of the ten million or more privileged bureaucrats of the country. Their power is based on the bureaucratic empires they head—vast hierarchies of officials, with the expense accounts and unaccounted opportunities to pilfer, the jobs they can grant, etc.

Last December when the reverses of the Polish assertion of independence and the Hungarian Revolution appeared to have temporarily frightened off some of Khrushchev's supporters in the

Kremlin, the faction of Malenkov, Molotov and Kaganovich pushed through a plan for industrial reorganization to be carried out by a man of their choice—Pervukhin. Unfortunately for them Khrushchev was able to rally his wavering allies in the Kremlin back in time to prevent their reorganization and to supersede their plan with one of his own—to be carried out by himself.

Previously industry was managed by vertical trusts culminating in ministries in Moscow. Thus all steel plants in the USSR were part of a single bureaucratic empire run by a Moscow ministry; and so on with other major divisions of industry. All these are abolished. Now all industry is decentralized into 105 geographical districts with a management council in each district for all mines, factories and building operations within the district. The staffing of these councils will afford the opportunity for reshuffling the officials and rebuilding the industrial bureaucratic machine to Khrushchev and his victorious Kremlin allies.

Is the decentralization a step towards democratization of So-

viet industry? Certainly neither Khrushchev nor any other Kremlin leader intends it to be such. True, in the speeches and officially conducted national discussion that preceded its formal adoption there were generalities about the decentralization plan's benefits for the workers and the desirability of workers expressing their views on it. But these did not go beyond the limits of the usual propaganda generalities. Despite this, there is every probability that the Soviet workers will make an unasked contribution in the form of forcing some democratization into it.

Even before the plan was adopted Soviet workers had given a demonstration of their growing combativity in a USSR-wide series of local actions, including strikes, election of militant factory committees, etc., against the revision of wages and production norms handed down from above. (See June 10 Militant.)

These struggles, some of which were victorious, were waged on a local scale. Undoubtedly new struggles lie ahead. Under the circumstances the decentralization is an advantage. Workers in a factory

or district will no longer be faced with the problem of trying to jolt a whole bureaucratic pyramid extending all the way to Moscow and the remote ministries. They will be confronted with their factory manager and the district economic council on disputes affecting wages and working conditions. This is a much less formidable obstacle one that can be more readily shaken and forced to grant concessions.

Parallel to the decentralization of industry there is a decentralization of trade unions. These national organizations to cajole and police the workers have long been trade unions in name only. Letters of factory workers appearing in the Soviet newspapers call for paring down the number of bureaucrats on the union payrolls but argue against "pulverizing" the unions themselves. In Trud, the official Soviet Union trade union paper, the letters column has had a lively debate about the presidents of elected factory committees. Some writers adopting the line for paring down the number of full-time union employees are against these presidents being put on the union payroll. They should continue working in the

plants, it is argued. Others say it is impossible for presidents to work an eight-hour day in the factory and then carry out union work. Moreover, they argue, a committee president should not be at the mercy of and on the payroll of the factory manager with whom he will have to negotiate for his fellow workers on piece-work rates, etc.

This discussion, muted as it must be in the pages of Trud, betokens an awakening of trade-union consciousness in the plants that points to the reconstruction of a union movement, independent of and in conflict with the bureaucracy. Such a job cannot begin at the top of the official so-called unions but must begin at the bottom with struggles led first by factory committees and then later by regional committees. Everything indicates the beginning of a struggle by the Soviet proletariat that will adopt as its slogan that which has just begun to be whispered—workers' councils and workers' control of production.

THE MILITANT

Published Weekly in the Interest of the Working People
THE MILITANT PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION
 116 University Pl., N. Y. 3, N. Y. Phone: AL 5-7468
 Editor: DANIEL ROBERTS
 Business Manager: FRANCES JAMES

Reprinted articles by contributors do not necessarily represent The Militant's policies. These are expressed in its editorials.
 *Entered as second class matter March 7, 1944 at the Post Office at New York, N.Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

Vol. XXI - No. 28

Monday, July 15, 1957

Ten Years of Taft-Hartley

What has been happening to the American labor movement since the passage of the Taft-Hartley Law ten years ago on June 23, 1947 — a day that has become known to unionists as "Black Monday"?

We don't ascribe all the difficulties and evils that beset the labor movement to the passage of any single law — even a law like Taft-Hartley. Generally, the laws on the books tend to reflect the relation of forces in the class struggle.

Big Business, which controls the law-making bodies and the entire government of this country, will always try to use its power to stop the onward march of labor. But often, when the labor or civil rights movement is in an upsurge, when mass movements and militant struggles of the working people are taking place, important concessions to labor will be made and written into law. This in turn gives labor a new weapon with which to press forward.

On the other hand, when the fighting capacity of the labor movement declines, when there is an ebb in mass activity and a conservative bureaucracy begins to usurp the functions of delegated bodies directly responsible to an alert and militant membership, the employers will use their political power to enact laws that cripple the labor movement and open the way to its eventual destruction.

Since the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act labor has been under continuous political assault. Section 14 (b) of the Law, which encouraged the states to pass anti-labor legislation more oppressive to the unions than the parent act itself has spawned the infamous "right-to-work" laws in 18 states.

According to the June issue of the AFL-CIO Metal Trades Bulletin, "membership in unions skyrocketed from 3.72 million in 1935 to 14.9 million in 1946. . . When Taft-Hartley was passed there were about 15.4 million union members in the United States. In the ten years since passage membership has risen about 2.5 million but the labor force has gained eight million workers."

In other words, the relative weight of organized labor in the working class as a whole has declined during the last ten years. The organization of the unorganized has been virtually halted. Anti-union bosses can now intimidate and terrorize workers who are trying to form unions. The use of injunctions against

strikes is widespread. Picketing has been restricted. Secondary boycotts are outlawed. The federal government can move with all its power on the side of the employers in so-called "national emergency" strikes.

During these ten years, while labor was being flayed by Big-Business-controlled federal and state legislatures, the labor officials were becoming more deeply enmeshed in the capitalist political machines that run these legislatures. This process has kept pace with the whole trend of transforming the union leadership from fighting representatives of the workers into "labor statesmen" whose chief qualifications are an ability "to get along with management."

Read the excerpts on this page of the Militant from a paper submitted by George W. Brooks of the Brotherhood of Paper Mill Workers to a meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association. Brooks, who is himself a part of the new labor bureaucracy, presents a most revealing description of the mentality and outlook of these "labor statesmen." They feel far more at home in cordial relations with management than they do at a union meeting, let alone a picket line. They regard pressures and demands from the rank and file as irritating disturbances and have devised many mechanisms to perfect the rule of the unions "from the top."

This privileged caste of bureaucrats that run the unions will prove utterly worthless as a leadership in a crisis. The magazine Business Week, expressing the view that Taft-Hartley went "too far" said in 1948, "Given a few million unemployed in America, given an Administration in Washington which was not pro-union — the Taft-Hartley Act conceivably could wreck the labor movement."

Well, there is no pro-union administration in Washington and there hasn't been one for as far back as we can remember. And the present inflated prosperity bubble, based on an armaments economy, is not going to last forever. Labor will face a showdown with Capital sooner or later. When that happens the working-class ranks will fight back. The tide that has been flowing against labor for so long will be reversed by the mighty upsurge of the working people themselves.

When such a turn comes the union ranks will change their leadership and reestablish democracy. They will also alter labor's political policy fundamentally by forming a Labor Party and challenging the political rule of Big Business in this country.

A Union Official Views His Associates

(We publish below excerpts from a speech given by George W. Brooks, a representative of the Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers Union, to the ninth annual meeting of the Industrial Relations Research Association as printed in the February issue of Monthly Labor Review. Despite our differences with Brooks' point of view, the speech is of interest as it gives some of the reasons for the loss of rank and file control of the unions. — Ed.)

The great change in American labor unions during the last 20 years has been a general shift in power and control from the members to the leaders. The change was far reaching; it appears to be permanent. The change has taken place almost wholly without constitutional reform. For practical purposes,

the written constitution and by-laws of national unions are the same as they were 25 years ago or when they were originally adopted. But before the forties, any strong central tendencies were offset, and frequently more than offset, by two omnipresent, disagreeable facts; widespread employer antiunionism and rival unionism, the latter often with a leftwing spice. . .

There were certain guarantees in the constitution, but these were seriously inhibited by the operations of one-party governments. The unanimous report, the solid slate of incumbents for reelection, the infrequent and ceremonial conventions, and similar institutions, all had the effect of discouraging effective opposition from within. But there were offsets. Faced with

an arrogant official attitude, a fundamental mistake in judgment, or a failure to respond to local wishes, a local union could leave the national union. If it simply wished to withdraw, the employer was always ready to be helpful. Or, if the local members were persuaded of the value of unionism, but not of this union, there was always a rival ready to welcome them with open arms.

BOTH ROUTES CLOSED

Both of these routes are now closed, in the "protected" sections of industry. The employer typically does not now welcome withdrawal from the international union. This is particularly true of the industrial relations officer who knows he owes his job to the union. The local dissenters thus find themselves confronted today by a solid front of opposition which includes both the national union and the company. Within the past two years, the alternate route has been closed by the no-raid agreements and the AFL-CIO merger. Except in unorganized plants, therefore, the local people have a very restricted freedom of choice. These changes, whether good or bad, have completely altered the old balance between local and national unions. . .

Centralization of the negotiations has been accompanied to

a very considerable extent by a centralization of the administration of the contract. Even the routines of the local union — wage adjustment, grievance handling, and the like — are being transferred to an increasing degree to functionaries outside the local union. As the [collective bargaining] process is removed further from local plants and local unions, the bargaining takes on a less personal character, and tends to become more of a pageant or drama. There is much less of the "give and take" of negotiations who are familiar with local details and, therefore, willing to agree to variety and deviations.

'STATESMANSHIP'

The role of the union negotiator himself has undergone subtle but fundamental changes. He enjoys the confidence of management, more often than not. He finds that management has been surprisingly willing (especially during the past 15 years) to grant significant concessions on wages, hours, and working conditions. He tends to believe that this state of affairs is permanent and reliable. His primary responsibility is to get a settlement. In his efforts to bring about an agreement, he frequently finds that it is the local union and not the company which is the stumbling block. His role changes, therefore; he

becomes more and more a mediator. . . This is called "statesmanship."

. . . Union leaders whose experience goes back more than 20 years are now a tiny minority of the total number of persons employed by unions on a full-time basis. . . Naturally, the first requirement [of union officials] is that they be able to "get along with management." It is not nearly so necessary that they be able to capture and retain the "loyalty" of workers. . .

I think a more important advantage [in this new "statesmanship"] is the nearly universal consent which the unions in manufacturing industries now give to technological change. There is no point at which the national and local leadership are likely to be more sharply differentiated in their opinions than on this issue. Local union members are always uneasy about, and usually opposed to, technological change. The national union, on the other hand, is likely to take the statesmanlike view. A shift in power to the national union therefore strengthens the hand of management in making technological change.

Young Socialist League Holds Nat'l Convention

NEW YORK, July 3 — The Third National Convention of the Young Socialist League concluded here today after three days of sharp debate on issues involving the

if their proposed "unity" were accepted. The right wing changed the constitution to specifically exclude the young members of the Socialist Workers Party and to prohibit YSL members from joining the SWP. In addition applicants for membership in the YSL who expressed sympathy for the left-wing viewpoint were not admitted.

Under the heading of implementing its orientation towards the SP-SDF, the right wing passed constitutional amendments and special motions that in effect deprived the left wing of any possibility to operate as a legitimate tendency within the organization.

In short, the right wing fundamentally transformed the YSL into an instrument of Shachtman's political line. While stopping short of an explicit expulsion, the right wing served notice that there was no place in the YSL for anyone who would not go along with the policy of capitulation to social-democracy. The struggle between the left and right wings of the convention was systematically expressed on a number of basic issues. The left wing moved to specifically reject Shachtman's proposal to refrain from running socialist candidates in opposition to "labor endorsed" capitalist party candidates; the right-wing majority refused to do so.

A full dress debate took place on the Hungarian revolution in which the right wing unfolded a policy of supporting capitalist democracy as the lesser evil to Stalinism, while left wingers pressed for the slogan of all power to the workers' councils.

There was a brief but significant debate on the labor

probe. The left wing opposed intervention into the affairs of the unions by labor-hating congressional inquisitors and opposed support to the Reutherite policy of collaboration with these congressional committees. The right wing, on the other hand, defended collaboration with Reuther on the premise that socialists must work with the "progressive, more socially minded sections of the labor bureaucracy."

Khrushchev Indicts Rivals

(The following are excerpts from the speech delivered by Nikita Khrushchev, Communist Party boss, in Leningrad on July 6. We print them for the further information of our readers. — Ed.)

The success of our industry and our country as a whole are great and important. We want our industry and its foundation, the heavy industry, to grow and become stronger. We wish our agriculture to grow and develop even more successfully. . .

We have reorganized the management of industry and building. One hundred and five economic councils have been set up in the country and have already started work. . .

You have probably read already about the decisions of the plenary session of the Central Committee on the anti-party group of Malenkov, Kaganovich and Molotov. The group had a cowardly scheme. It wanted to seize in its hands the key posi-

tion in the party and in the Government in order to change the political line of the party. They actively opposed such measures, for instance, as the widening of the scope of the rights of union republics in the field of economic and cultural construction and in matters of legislation. They were against carrying out a reorganization in the management of industry and building, against promoting a movement among state farm workers, collective farm workers and agricultural workers to catch up with America in the per capita production of milk, butter and meat in the next few years.

CUT THEMSELVES OFF

All these and other important measures of the party aimed at improving the material position of the Soviet people met with an active opposition of those who had cut themselves off from the facts of life of the country, from the nation and the people.

In the sphere of foreign policy, that group, and in particular, comrade Molotov, have been obstructing with all available means the implementation of measures for the relaxation of international tension and the consolidation of peace in the whole world. . .

As in home, so in foreign policy questions they adopted a narrow, lifeless attitude toward Marxism-Leninism. When they were convinced that all their incorrect statements and actions constantly met with a rebuff in the Central Committee, they took a course condemned by the party — one of plotting among themselves secretly — a course of factional struggle.

ALL UNANIMOUS

Everyone knows how this ended. The Central Committee of the party unanimously condemned this anti-party group as well as the careerist Shepilov who joined them, who showed himself to be most shamelessly two-faced. . .

Comrades, the decisions of the June plenum of the Central Committee have met with the unanimous approval of the party and the whole Soviet people. . . Our party's policy is clear. It wholly answers the basic, vital interests of the people, both in internal and foreign politics, and is always governed by the great Leninist principles and will constantly bring to life the line worked out by the 20th Congress of the party. . .

Comrades, the unmasking of, and the unanimous condemnation by the plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and people, of the anti-party group of Malenkov, Kaganovich and Molotov will help still more in bringing to life the historic decisions of the 20th Congress of the party, because their removal means the removal of all those forces who were trying to hamper the fulfillment of these decisions. . .

Khrushchev Indicts Rivals

tions in the party and in the Government in order to change the political line of the party.

They actively opposed such measures, for instance, as the widening of the scope of the rights of union republics in the field of economic and cultural construction and in matters of legislation. They were against carrying out a reorganization in the management of industry and building, against promoting a movement among state farm workers, collective farm workers and agricultural workers to catch up with America in the per capita production of milk, butter and meat in the next few years.

CUT THEMSELVES OFF

All these and other important measures of the party aimed at improving the material position of the Soviet people met with an active opposition of those who had cut themselves off from the facts of life of the country, from the nation and the people.

In the sphere of foreign policy, that group, and in particular, comrade Molotov, have been obstructing with all available means the implementation of measures for the relaxation of international tension and the consolidation of peace in the whole world. . .

As in home, so in foreign policy questions they adopted a narrow, lifeless attitude toward Marxism-Leninism. When they were convinced that all their incorrect statements and actions constantly met with a rebuff in the Central Committee, they took a course condemned by the party — one of plotting among themselves secretly — a course of factional struggle.

ALL UNANIMOUS

Everyone knows how this ended. The Central Committee of the party unanimously condemned this anti-party group as well as the careerist Shepilov who joined them, who showed himself to be most shamelessly two-faced. . .

Comrades, the decisions of the June plenum of the Central Committee have met with the unanimous approval of the party and the whole Soviet people. . . Our party's policy is clear. It wholly answers the basic, vital interests of the people, both in internal and foreign politics, and is always governed by the great Leninist principles and will constantly bring to life the line worked out by the 20th Congress of the party. . .

Comrades, the unmasking of, and the unanimous condemnation by the plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and people, of the anti-party group of Malenkov, Kaganovich and Molotov will help still more in bringing to life the historic decisions of the 20th Congress of the party, because their removal means the removal of all those forces who were trying to hamper the fulfillment of these decisions. . .

Ideological Struggle Versus Wrecking Tactics

By Murry Weiss

I attended several sessions of the Young Socialist League convention held in New York City the first three days of July. (See story, this page.) At one of the sessions a delegate requested that I be given a few minutes to explain a letter I had written to James P. Cannon in June 1955, where I expressed the opinion that it was necessary for revolutionary socialists to conduct an ideological struggle against the influence of Shachtman among a section of the radical youth. Excerpts from this letter had been published in Labor Action, the Young Socialist Review and had been quoted at the convention.

I used the few minutes at my disposal to express my conviction that the viewpoint I held in June 1955 was basically correct and has moreover been confirmed by the recent course Shachtman and his organization have taken. I pointed out that at this very convention Shachtman was proposing that the YSL give up its political and organizational independence and enter the American social-democratic sect, the Socialist Party-Socialist Democratic Federation — on the program of the social democracy. I pointed out that Shachtman had just presented a resolution to his own organization, the Independent Socialist League, calling for the abandonment of socialist opposition to capitalist party candidates if these candidates were

endorsed by the labor bureaucracy.

I had felt in 1955 that the fundamental struggle the Socialist Workers Party majority had conducted on the eve of World War II against Shachtman and his supporters had significance for the new generation of radical youth and was not a "finished chapter belonging to the dead past." I said in this letter, "We will be badly mistaken if we think we can 'by-pass' even the Shachtmanites, as well as the Cochranites, in ideological battles. The awakening youth will examine all programs and tendencies. They will not take our word for anything. I held that the internal disputes of the past were not 'over obscure doctrinal points of fine interest only to a sect. They were over the great programmatic issues of our epoch and they have burning meaning in the world today.'"

I said further, "This does not mean that we are interested in any fusion or entry with these people [the Shachtmanites]. Our only interest is how to smash them. But this must be done at every stage anew. And it must be done with ideological weapons." (Emphasis added.)

IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE AND WRECKING ACTIVITY

At the convention the national chairman of the YSL, Michael Harrington, said in reply to me that he knew very well what was meant by "ideological struggles" and "ideological weapons." It meant, Harrington insisted, "wrecking and smashing" the YSL.

Harrington's assertion is completely false. When I declared

that it was necessary to smash the ideological influence of Shachtmanism with the ideological weapons of revolutionary socialism, that was quite different from calling for the wrecking of the YSL through organizational maneuvers. Harrington deliberately chose to ignore this important distinction.

Harrington and the other leaders of the YSL majority used their interpretation of my letter to justify their rejection of the proposal made by Socialist Workers Party youth that instead of liquidating itself into the social democracy, the YSL open its doors to all radical youth and build a broad, united socialist youth organization in the United States. The youth of the Socialist Workers Party and organizations close to them have held the position that a healthy socialist youth organization cannot be politically and organizationally dominated by either the Stalinists or the Social Democrats; that it must remain organizationally independent of all the adult tendencies; and that it must be an arena for youth to find their own way, by their own paths to revolutionary socialist conclusions.

To this proposal the YSL right wing leaders have said: (1) this is only a maneuver to "smash us," and (2) we are determined to affiliate with the SP-SDF, so your proposal has no meaning to us, even if you are sincere.

OFF-REPEATED CHARGE

The charge of "wrecking" and "raiding" has been heard many times during the current regroupment discussion. It has been leveled against the Communist

Party, on the basis of its record under the domination of the bureaucratic machine of Stalinism. Ironically, the SP-SDF leaders have kept Shachtman's ISL and his supporters in the YSL out of their party for over a year, despite all urging and pleading, on the basis of their suspicion that Shachtman is planning a raid to "smash" them.

We also hear, from both Shachtman and the CP, that the Socialist Workers Party is only interested in raiding and that it is out to "wreck" all rival organizations.

It is necessary to examine more closely this whole question of relations among different tendencies and organizations in the workers' movement in general and the relations of all these tendencies to the youth movement in particular.

In my opinion the roots of this problem will be found in the bureaucratization of the workers' movement both in the West and in the Soviet Union. The labor bureaucracies and the Stalinists strangled the democratic life of the workers' movement. In the case of the labor bureaucracies of the West this was done through a combination of collusion with the witch-hunting police of the capitalist state plus the establishment of a regime of repression against all radical opponents.

In the case of Stalinism it was done through the usurpation of power in the Soviet Union by an uncontrolled, bureaucratic terror-machine which then reached out and destroyed the independence and internal democracies of the Communist parties. The Left Opposition in

the Communist parties, from which the present Socialist Workers Party stems, was deprived of all democratic rights and forcibly separated from contact with the party ranks.

In view of these circumstances, revolutionary socialists who refused to be silenced and isolated from the radical and labor movement, were compelled to fight to remain in or re-enter the workers' organizations. They conducted this fight in the face of police methods used to expel and isolate them. Whereupon, both the labor bureaucracies and the Stalinists would charge these revolutionists with "conspiracies" to "wreck" and "disrupt" the organized workers' movement.

STALINIST TACTICS OF 'RULE-OR-RUIN'

An additional and important source of the fear of raiding and organizational maneuvers stems from the activities of the Stalinized Communist parties during the past decades. These parties carried on an aggressive campaign, not to extend their ideological influence in open debate with rival tendencies in the workers' movement, but to impose their organizational control over the entire movement by mechanical and bureaucratic methods.

It is false to confound Stalinist maneuvers and manipulations with the struggle to advance a program and to prove through propaganda and the test of experience the correctness of this program as against others. It is likewise false to echo the charge of the labor bureaucrats that revolutionaries are engaged in "wrecking" and "disruptive" activities when they refuse to

allow the bureaucrats to oust them from the unions.

All this is not to say that relations between radical workers' organizations have been irreproachable or that any organization can claim it has made no mistakes. But mistakes made by revolutionary socialists who were under attack by capitalist reaction, the labor bureaucrats and the Stalinists are of a different order than the "mistakes" made by bureaucratic machines which have poisoned the whole atmosphere and rendered normal relations among various currents in the labor movement impossible.

The SWP is emphatically opposed to the concept of wrecking rival organizations. The concept is in its very essence bureaucratic and substitutes organization devices for the necessary ideological and political struggle which will permit workers to freely choose their political and organizational allegiance. To the bureaucrats everything is orderly and proper only when the workers stay put, voice no dissenting thoughts and leave matters of policy to the wisdom of high officials. Above all they want no troublesome oppositionists around to disturb the bureaucratic peace.

SOCIALIST YOUTH NEEDS INDEPENDENCE

The method of substituting organizational domination for political persuasion is particularly harmful and even ruinous when it is applied to the relations between adult political tendencies and the socialist youth movement. All experience teaches that the youth must have complete organizational independence in order to work out for themselves

their approach to revolutionary theory and practice.

Speaking specifically of the Young Socialist League, it has during the three years of its existence maintained its independence as a socialist youth movement. Moreover it developed a number of fine traditions of internal democracy and a willingness to include in its ranks youth who did not in advance accept the political views of the dominant tendency of Shachtmanism.

SHACHTMAN BENDS YSL TO HIS COURSE

On the other hand, the consequences of the influence of Shachtmanism within the YSL are now being felt precisely in the transformation of the YSL from a nucleus of a broad socialist youth organization into an exclusive appendage to Shachtman's organization. It has been converted into a Shachtmanite youth faction that drives out and excludes all radical youth who will not swallow Shachtman's line of political adaptation to social democracy.

The YSL has now set up barriers to youth who are militantly opposed to accepting the SP-SDF as the exclusive parent organization of the socialist youth. If the YSL is wrecked it will be due entirely to this policy of Shachtman and not to the ideological struggle of the SWP against Shachtmanism.

The mistake the SWP made, in my opinion, was that it didn't recognize soon enough the YSL's distinctive character as an independent socialist youth organization. It is obvious to all close observers of the YSL that it has always held conflicting tendencies, including a left-wing cur-

rent in opposition to Shachtman's rightward course. Recently, when this course reached the point where Shachtman's supporters proposed to scuttle the independence of the YSL and to accept the program and organizational domination of the social democrats, a full-scale struggle broke out. A left-wing caucus emerged and waged a battle to prevent the transformation of the YSL into Shachtman's instrument for conciliation and adaptation to social democracy.

The SWP made the mistake of assuming that because the Shachtmanites wielded considerable influence in the YSL that the YSL was therefore a mere "youth version" of Shachtmanism. Events have disproven this idea. By joining the other forces in the YSL which were working against the danger of complete Shachtmanite domination, the SWP youth could have played a far more effective role over the past years in preventing the dissolution of the YSL as the framework for a revitalized and militant socialist youth movement in the U.S.

Whatever the outcome of the current struggle in the YSL, the movement towards an independent, militant, socialist youth movement that will invite all radical youth into its ranks is now on the march. The movement will find its proper organization form despite all obstacles. Our advice to the socialist youth organization that will emerge out of the present regroupment process, is that it retain its independence from all the adult organizations. Thereby it will best permit its ranks to develop towards revolutionary socialist ideas as a result of their own experiences.

(Continued from page 1)

their plight. The protest movement expresses itself presently by a better than 90% refusal of the Tuskegee Negroes to do business with some 40 local white merchants. Already three businesses including the Macon theater (the only motion picture theater in town), a dry goods store, and a novelty shop have closed their doors; and several others are tottering. All the larger establishments have released a large portion of their help. The end of this trend is nowhere in sight, for most of the Negroes here are employed at privately endowed Tuskegee Institute and the Federally supported Veterans Administration hospital and receive about 80% of the area's \$12 million annual payroll. In the meantime Engelhardt's bill still awaits action by Governor James E. Folsom.

On my arrival at the church around 6:30 the gathering there had filled every inch of space inside the church, and by the time the meeting got under way

"I believe in a government of the people, for the people and by the people. But we are segregated and classified as a special kind of people. Being such, we should have our elected representatives in government. Taxation without representation is still tyranny."

Answering charges by Engelhardt that he had been cited years ago by the House Un-American Activities Committee, Mr. Gomillion said that he has never been informed of any charges of "subversion" by any government agency.

The Rev. K. L. Buford, pastor of the Butler Chapel AME Zion Church and featured speaker of

At one point Rev. Buford asked: "Is it un-American to fight for freedom and equality, for the right to vote?"

RESENT VIOLATIONS

The audience retorted with a resounding "No!"

"The real un-Americans," Rev. Buford continued, "are those people who hide in closets and say they are sick or have no proper office equipment when we try to register to vote. Our civil rights have been violated. We resent these violations. We are protesting and will continue to protest until we win our rights."

The ten, five and one dollar bills flowed into the collection boxes. Rev. S. T. Martin, pastor of Mt. Olive Baptist Church, joyously held up a check for \$50 he received from the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights of Birmingham.

Among the out-of-town visitors introduced to the audience were the Reverends Martin Luther King (whose appearance brought standing cheers and shouts of praise), Ralph D. Abernathy, and F. L. Shuttlesworth, president of the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights.

Rev. King told the cheering crowd that he "came to be inspired by you. You are not seeking to put the stores out of business, but justice in business."

Rev. Abernathy, Vice-president of the Montgomery Improvement Association, evoked long ovations and shouts of praise when he said "the 50,000 Negroes of Montgomery are with you in your struggle."

Rev. Shuttlesworth of Birmingham brought much cheering and a long ovation when he said: "Those who can't see in 1957 that we are going to get our civil rights are looking through 1857 looking glasses."

The meeting ended with everyone clapping his neighbors' hands in a bond of fellowship and solidarity as we all sang with thundering voices, which reverberated throughout the entire area in and around the Washington Chapel AME Church, "Till We Meet Again."

Calendar Of Events

New York

Wednesday, July 17, 8 P.M. "The Kremlin Purge — Its Real Significance." Speaker: Harry Ring, Militant staff writer. Adelphi Hall, 74 Fifth Ave., near 14th St. Contribution 50 cents. Aup.: Militant Labor Forum.

Detroit

Friday, July 19, 8 P.M. — "The New Soviet Purge" — 3737 Woodward — The Friday Night Socialist Forum.

Los Angeles

Friday, July 19, 8:15 P.M. "What's Behind the New Kremlin Shake-up?" Arne Swaback, speaker. Channing Hall, 2936 W. 8th St. Auspices: Los Angeles Local, Socialist Workers Party.

Chicago

Picnic, Sunday, July 21. Dan Ryan Woods, 87th St. and Western Ave. (Follow the signs to grove). Fun, food, games, prizes. Bring the family. Aup.: Militant Labor Forum, 777 West Adams, CE 6-4183.

Cleveland

Ohio Annual Militant Readers Picnic

Sunday, July 21 Starting 10 A.M.

AT HINCKLEY LAKE PARK

Swimming — Boating Baseball — Badminton Picnic lunch served at 1 P.M.

Look for sign saying "The Militant" near park entrance on Medina County Road 140.

The Santana Case

Tragedy of a Puerto Rican Youth

By Joyce Cowley

17 pages 10 cents

Order from: Pioneer Publishers 116 University Place New York 3, N.Y.

... Liberals Knife Rights Bill



Victims of the hurricane that hit Louisiana coast, June 27, are shown above after being transported by a navy helicopter from areas hit by the storm. Although a Federal disaster insurance program is on the books, Congress has failed to appropriate funds to put it into effect.

Louisiana Flood Victims Could Have Been Saved

By Shirley Clark

JULY 9—The estimate of the number of dead in the hurricane that hit the Louisiana coast June 27 varies from 500 to over 1,000. The bodies are still being collected. Many may never be recovered. Ken Dixon of the Lake Charles American Press pointed out that it is possible that two-thirds of the bodies were swept into the Gulf of Mexico.

The amount of devastation can be seen in the fact that in the town of Cameron, only the steel and concrete court house was left intact. Surrounding low-lying towns were also smashed. One report said, "The resort community of Holly Beach no longer exists. It was completely wiped off the map."

UNNECESSARY DEATHS

Val Peterson, the President's personal representative to the scene of the disaster, announced, July 2, that no loss of life had been necessary. According to him the people of Cameron and the surrounding area failed to heed the warnings of the Weather Bureau.

On July 6, the U.S. Weather Bureau in a warning to everyone on the East Coast of the United States said, "It can happen here and to you personally. People around Cameron, La., just couldn't believe, apparently, that it could happen to them. As a result, hundreds died, despite twelve to eighteen hours advance notice."

But the people of Louisiana have a different story to tell. Sheriff O. B. Carter of Cameron according to Bob Considine, INS reporter, June 30, has

denied Civil Defense reports that the people of Cameron had been given ample warning of the approach of the hurricane.

WRONG PREDICTION

Carter said, "Last thing I heard on the radio before turning in Wednesday night was that she wouldn't hit until late afternoon the next day. So everybody said 'we got plenty of time.' Well she hit at four the next morning. We got soaked."

The July 9 New York Times published a letter from an angry woman from Louisiana. "We hadn't even found all our dead, much less counted them," wrote Ruth Christ Sullivan, "when the President's representative, Val Peterson, dealt us another blow. If he had talked to any of the thousands of us who listened carefully to the hurricane news he could not have told the President the giant toll of casualties was because our people were too stubborn to leave!"

"All day Wednesday and far into the night," she testified, "we were cautioned to remain calm, even to get a good night's sleep, because the hurricane was not to hit until late Thursday afternoon or Thursday night. Cameron residents packed their cars, planning to leave for higher ground early Thursday morning. But when they awoke the hurricane was upon them. . . ."

"Friday a numb populace began to lash out at the Weather Bureau. And more suddenly than Audrey, releases from Weather Bureau hierarchy began calling Hurricane Audrey the 'best tracked hurricane' ever."

The account given by this woman and many others differs

substantially from the official story that has been given out. Whatever the truth may be, there can be no question that the responsibility for evacuating people in dangerous areas belongs to the government. People who didn't "heed" the Civil Defense demands in the 1956 "Operation Alert," organized for an imaginary disaster, were thrown into jail.

Today there are local, state and federal agencies on the scene of the Louisiana catastrophe. Helicopters, boats and trucks are at hand — not to evacuate live people, but to recover the bodies of the dead as the waters of the flood recede.

And what about the survivors? What of those who have lost all they have and must start from scratch?

Bob Considine told of a "stocky, sun-bronzed man with a three-day beard" who called him over. "I heard you were here," the man said. "Put this in your paper. I've got 50 dead people on ice in my fishing boat right over there, some 50 poor stiffies who deserved something better."

"We need quick help, or a lot more of us are going to die. Put something in your paper that maybe will be read up the line somewhere. Put in there that they need \$10,000,000 down here right away, to save a lot of poor hard-working Americans."

"And if somebody asks where the \$10,000,000 is going to come from, tell him to put a rider on one of those bills that send billions of dollars overseas. . . ."

Government officials aren't likely to listen to this unnamed man. Such people aren't even quoted in the press unless disaster strikes them. But he deserves to be heard a thousand times more than the official voices. Multiply this man's figure of \$10,000,000 by 3,000 and you'll have the amount the government spends on "defense" of its citizens every year, around \$30 billion for war material to destroy life. The ten million is only a drop in the bucket.

Two days after the hurricane Franco, the fascist dictator of Spain, received twice as much as the man in Louisiana asked — \$20 million. That brought the total to Franco from the U.S. to \$70 million.

All this war spending keeps profits high and profits are the mainspring of the capitalist system. There is precious little concern for anything else as far as the Big Business government goes. Isn't it time we had a government of workers, simple people, who care for human life instead of profits?

New York Militant Labor Forum

"The Kremlin Purge — Its Real Significance"

Speaker: HARRY RING Militant Staff Writer

Wed., July 17 — 8 P.M. Adelphi Hall

74 Fifth Ave. (near 14th St.) Contribution 50 cents

(Continued from page 1)

to be next week. If the Morse motion fails, the bill then faces a Dixiecrat filibuster.

Morse tried to justify his action by pointing to technical clerical errors that appeared in the bill which he said would have been eliminated if it had gone through "historic committee procedure" — namely East-reference to the fact that the committee would cut the bill to ribbons while "correcting" the technicalities. He covered his self-out with the following words: "I yield to no one in the Senate in devoted dedication to the cause of guaranteeing first class citizenship to all our citizens. However, I am opposed to adopting an end-justifies-the-means doctrine adopted by those who have put this bill on the Senate calendar in violation of historic committee procedure and justice."

This same concern for "justice" in favor of the organizers of racist terror, but not for the victims of that terror, was exhibited by Senator O'Mahoney who introduced an amendment to the bill which would remove its only "tooth." The O'Mahoney amendment would assure the right of trial by jury — an all-white racist jury, that is — in all cases except where voting rights are involved, and in the latter cases where a question of fact is in dispute. Needless to say, the racists will always be able to claim a "disputed fact."

The actions of Morse and O'Mahoney were believed to be part of a deal, evidence of which was reported in the June 22 New York Times, between North-western liberal Democrats and the Dixiecrats. Reportedly, the latter would vote for the Hells Canyon dam bill, favored by the liberals, and in return the liberals would help smother the civil rights bill. A further indication of this deal is that in their unsuccessful attempt June 20 to refer the civil rights bill to Eastland's committee, the Dixiecrats were joined by Morse as well as by liberal Democrats James E. Murray of Montana, James F. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Warren Magnusen of Washington and Mike Mansfield of Montana.

This is just the latest in the hypocrisy which is typical of the role of the whole group of liberals in the Senate regarding civil rights legislation. They campaign and try to collect votes on the issue, but fail to make a serious fight when the showdown comes. Even those liberals who have made the record supporting the bill this last week must bear responsibility for the effectiveness of the Dixiecrat stand. All of them, Senator Douglas and Humphrey included, were party to a plan last January which eliminated any effective fight against Senate Rule 22 and left the Dixiecrat filibuster weapon intact.

These are the kind of "friends" that the labor leaders — and the leadership of Communist Party, too — have been urging the workers and the Negro people to support. It is in order to back these charlatans, that they have sacrificed building a Labor Party.

Try to Yank Teeth From New York Anti-Bias Bill

NEW YORK—The fight to bar discrimination in private housing in the city received a new stab in the back when both Senator Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.) and Charles Abrams, head of the State Commission against Discrimination, advocated removing enforcement provisions from the Sharkey-Brown-Isaacs anti-bias bill now before the City Council.

Both of these self-proclaimed champions of equal rights declared, July 7, that they opposed a provision in the bill to levy a \$500 fine against landlords guilty of practicing discrimination in rental of dwellings. Both politicians said they favored instead a process of "conciliation" whereby Jim Crow landlords would be convinced of the errors of their ways.

Abrams suggested that the "conciliation" process be patterned after the one used by SCAD, which also has no enforcement teeth and has consequently produced a minimum of results in eliminating discrimination.

Under this procedure, a committee would filter and investigate complaints, make a "confidential" effort to conciliate the charge, hold a public hearing where conciliation fails and then try to get a state Supreme Court enforcement order. Meanwhile a victimized citizen could settle down in some Jim Crow tenement for a few more years while the "conciliation" process creeps on.

The bill itself was originally scheduled for passage by the City Council last month. But when the city's powerful real estate interests put the heat on, Mayor Wagner, a liberal Democrat, yanked the rug from under it by announcing he was in no hurry to get it passed. With elections coming up, the City Council may now decide that rather than simply burying the bill it might be smarter to take hold of the Javits-Abrams suggestion and pass one that can't be enforced.

Burn Cross at Negro Home in Los Angeles

By Lois Saunders

LOS ANGELES, July 7—Klan-like terror and harassment, including the burning of a seven-foot cross and a threat of death, have "welcomed" twin sisters, both school teachers, who recently purchased a large hilltop home in View Park, an exclusive section of Los Angeles County.

They moved in about two weeks ago and since then, according to one of the sisters, Mrs. Evangeline Woods Johnson, they've been "sitting on a keg of dynamite."

Tennessee Racists Get All-White Jury

JULY 11 — The trial of John Kasper, a White Citizens Councils organizer, and 15 of his cohorts began in Knoxville, Tenn., yesterday. The defendants are accused of violating a federal injunction to prevent interference with integration in a Clinton high school last fall. They are represented by a battery of 16 lawyers who succeeded in eliminating from jury service all Negroes who had been called up for duty. They also eliminated a white man who worked for a company headed by a Jew. Kasper's attorney, J. Benjamin Simmons asked venireman, Will S. Temple for the names of the national officers of the company for which he worked. Then he asked, "Is he a Jew?" The answer was yes. Defense attorneys addressed Negro veniremen by their first names. Whites were called "mister."

of Montana.

This is just the latest in the hypocrisy which is typical of the role of the whole group of liberals in the Senate regarding civil rights legislation. They campaign and try to collect votes on the issue, but fail to make a serious fight when the showdown comes. Even those liberals who have made the record supporting the bill this last week must bear responsibility for the effectiveness of the Dixiecrat stand. All of them, Senator Douglas and Humphrey included, were party to a plan last January which eliminated any effective fight against Senate Rule 22 and left the Dixiecrat filibuster weapon intact.

These are the kind of "friends" that the labor leaders — and the leadership of Communist Party, too — have been urging the workers and the Negro people to support. It is in order to back these charlatans, that they have sacrificed building a Labor Party.

Can We Do It?

Coming in the Summer Issue of the

International Socialist Review

The Communist Party has proposed that an anti-monopoly coalition be built in the United States.

What does American history teach us about such projects in the past? What are the conclusions suggested by Marxist theory?

William F. Warde considers the American experience with anti-monopoly coalitions in "The Rise and Fall of Progressivism." Joseph Hansen, in "What the Job Takes," outlines the contributions of Marxist theory in the light of a problem first discovered and considered by an English socialist in 1839.

Make sure you don't miss these two important articles. Begin your subscription with the Summer number. Only \$2.50 for eight issues.

International Socialist Review

116 University Place New York 3, N. Y.

Cleveland Ohio Annual Militant Readers Picnic

Sunday, July 21 Starting 10 A.M.

AT HINCKLEY LAKE PARK

Swimming — Boating Baseball — Badminton Picnic lunch served at 1 P.M.

Look for sign saying "The Militant" near park entrance on Medina County Road 140.

The Santana Case

Tragedy of a Puerto Rican Youth

By Joyce Cowley

17 pages 10 cents

Order from: Pioneer Publishers 116 University Place New York 3, N.Y.

New York Evictions Raise Protests from Slum Tenants

By Lillian Kiezel
Socialist Workers Party Candidate
for President of the New York City Council

Let's join together and protect our interests against those of the real-estate and Big Businessmen and their representatives on the New York City Council. This is the sentiment that is growing among many tenants who live in city-condemned housing—on land that is being sold to private interests for the purpose of building so-called low-cost housing.

Robert Moses, Chairman of the Slum Clearance Committee stated on Sept. 4, 1956 in the New York Times that the Seward Park Housing plans would either involve down-payments by tenants of \$650 per room or it would involve paying a monthly rent of \$33.50 per room.

The Site Tenants and Businessmen's Committee, whose president is Rabbi N. Ben-Horim, points out in its brochure entitled "Where Can We Move?" that 94% of the families on the East Side earned less than \$4,000 per year according to the last census. Of these, one-third earned less than \$1,500 a year. Thus only about 6% of the people living in this area could afford that type of housing.

Where can these people go? Where can they live? They do not want to live in slums. But at the same time these working people are being forced to find

new homes and somehow stretch the family income to pay fantastic rents. Those who cannot do this are forced to get some sort of relief from the city—if they are lucky.

The Site Tenants and Businessmen's Committee, which is located at 200 East Broadway and has as its purpose to get decent housing for those who are now living in the slums, has a plan.

It is very simple: Nobody gets evicted and nobody moves out of their present homes until there is a new building for them to move into at rents they can afford to pay.

This is one of the proposals which will be placed before the City Planning Commission at its open hearing on the city housing problem on July 17.

It is vital that the working people of this city be represented at this hearing. The City Council must be told: (1) That evictions must stop now! (2) That the workers of New York City need and deserve decent housing.